

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall,
Moorgate Street,
Rotherham.

Date: Wednesday, 10th December,
2014

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 38 - 51)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 20 - 29)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 28 - 34)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 43 - 51)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 22 - 27)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 21 - 33)
7. Police and Crime Panel (Pages 39 - 42)

**HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
23rd October, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Wyatt (in the Chair); Councillors Dalton, Havenhand, Hunter, Jepson, Kaye, Swift, Vines, Whysall and Wootton and Robert Parkin (Speak-up).

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Sansome.

44. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

45. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no members of the public and press present at the meeting.

46. COMMUNICATIONS

Better Care Fund

Shona McFarlane, Director of Health and Wellbeing, reported that Rotherham had been required to submit a revised version of the Plan in accordance with a September deadline. It had gone through a process of moderation and feedback was awaited. Every Plan was checked by an independent assurance process commissioned by NHS England and a telephone conference call had taken place to check a few matters of fact and accuracy in the document.

The revisions to the Plan had included an additional action (BCF15) regarding End of Life. Each of the action plans were currently in the process of implementation and would update the Select Commission in due course.

Minor Oral Surgery

NHS England (NHSE) Area Team was consulting on proposals to commission dental procedures such as wisdom tooth extraction and removal of retained roots from specialists based in general dental practices rather than from the local hospital as at present. The proposals affected Rotherham and Sheffield as Barnsley and Bassetlaw had had such services based in the community for a number of years and NHSE planned to recommission them. There would be no overall reduction in the amount of activity commissioned.

The proposal was to have 1 contract for Rotherham to treat 600 patients per annum (which equated to 1 dentist seeing 14 patients per week).

The deadline for comments on the proposal was 6th November.

Resolved:- That a response on behalf of the Select Commission be submitted including comments with regard to location, access and disability access.

Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee

2 meetings were to be held in November to develop consultation responses to the proposed standards for Congenital Heart Disease Services for both children and adults.

(2) That Councillor Wyatt be nominated as the Select Commission's representative on the Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee.

(3) That Councillor Sansome be nominated as Councillor Wyatt's deputy on the Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee.

MyNHS

The above were the new web pages on the NHS Choices website containing health data that facilitated comparison with other areas on a number of measures/indicators for hospitals, social care, Public Health, services and outcomes and mental health hospitals.

NHS England Road Map

The Chairman commented on the information released in the press regarding the major issues facing the NHS and the budgetary pressures that needed to be addressed.

47. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 11th September, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting held on 11th September, 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

Arising from Minute No. 33(7) (Joint Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee), it was noted that the meeting had not taken place in September as previously reported due to issues with regard to parental consent for some of the information in the reports. The meeting would now take place on 21st November, 2014.

Arising from Minute No. 37 (Progress on Plans for New Emergency Centre), it was noted that the travel plan and IT procurement proposal were not ready for sharing with the Select Commission as yet. A representative would attend a Select Commission meeting in due course to give an overview on the IT system and what this would mean for patients and services.

48. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of meetings of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 2nd July, 27th August and 1st October, 2014.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the meeting be received and the contents noted.

49. ISSUES FROM ROTHERHAM HEALTHWATCH LTD.

It was noted that Melanie Hall was to leave her post at Healthwatch. The Chief Executive post was out to advert.

50. ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST

Resolved:- The minutes of the meeting with the Rotherham Foundation Trust held on 29th September, 2014, be noted.

51. NHS ROTHERHAM CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP - COMMISSIONING PLAN 2015-16

Chris Edwards, Chief Officer, Robin Carlisle, Deputy Chief Officer, and Lydia George, Rotherham CCG, referred to the powerpoint presentation which had recently been given to SCE/GPs which covered:-

- 2014/15 commissioning plan was available on the intranet – www.rotherhamccg.nhs.uk/our-plan.htm
- 2015/16 Plan was a refresh rather than a complete re-write
- CCG transformation capacity was finite so it was important that if new initiatives were prioritised some exiting initiatives were stopped
- Strategic Clinical Executive
- Clinical Referrals, Medicine Management and Mental Health
- Medicines Management
- Mental Health

2014/15 Progress and Issues

- Clinical Referrals
 - Early 2014/15 data show referrals and electives rising after 2 flat years
 - Audit programme and feedback via PLT working well, TRFT starting medical directorate 'PLT'
 - Follow-up audits failing to identify many opportunities to reduce follow-ups
- Medicines Management
 - Cost growth currently on track
 - 33 out of 36 practice plans agreed
 - Service redesign projects performing well but some risks regarding TRFT re-organisation
 - Waste

2015/16 Proposals

- Clinical Referrals
 - Develop a “Plan B” for the increase in referrals
 - Monitor and address issues with “other referrals”
 - Closer involvement of CCG in the development of RFT medical pathways
 - Improve access to neurology and develop appropriate pathways
 - Bench marking for GPs to improve quality and consistency
 - Development of pathways to provide advice on access to blood tests and imaging
 - Explore opportunities for self-care and non face-to-face consultations
 - Explore the market for primary care based Dermatology and Diabetes Services
 - Develop the prevention agenda with Public Health England

- Medicines Management
 - Same priorities plus realising the benefits of electronic prescribing (decreased waste)
 - Address the high admission rate for respiratory conditions and prescribing rates
 - Consider local and national risk of reducing waste
 - Address waste in term of general waste and in particular nursing home waste
 - Plan for the risk to special projects due to TRFT restructuring

- Mental Health and Learning Disabilities
 - 3 reviews carried out (Adults, CAMHS and Learning Disabilities)
 - Learning Disability – following consultation would implement the decision taken at 3rd September Governing Body
 - Action plan for RDaSH Services due to be agreed in September/October, common messages agreed, included being minded to contract with RDaSH as main provider but investing QIPP in voluntary sector or general practice
 - Adult and Older Peoples Mental Health Liaison Services most urgent issue
 - Issues with partnership working

- Adults and Older People
 - Implement action plan including improved data and pathways, Adult Mental Health liaison, primary care focussed model, improved IAPT, improved Dementia Services
 - Increase the number of mental health patients on the case management programme
 - Develop a dementia pathway with more focus on Primary Care and “one stop shops”
 - Involve the voluntary sector on the dementia pathway
 - Improve RDaSH communication with stakeholders and providers
 - Support RDaSH management of change

Obtain patient experience of instances of poor service in respect of long waiting times and poor communication
 Parity of esteem and 7/7 working
 Long term impact of Child Sexual Exploitation
 Learn from CRMC referral pathway work
 Address the acute management of the physical health of mental health patients
 Address the variations in Mental Health care (IAPT/Dementia)
 Extend Community Transformation to include IAPT and Dementia
 Measurable outcomes

- Mental Health CAMHS and Learning Disability
 CAMHS
 Ensure that 2014/15 improvements were maintained and that the extra consultant improved capacity
 Impact of Child Sexual Exploitation

 Learning Disability
 Evaluate the impact of Governing Body approved ATU/community investment decision
- Unscheduled Care and Transforming Community Services
 Urgent Care redesign
 Care Co-ordination Centre
 Transforming Community Services – Locality Based Nursing
 Increased use of Alternative Levels of Care to Hospital
- Transforming Community Services
 Priority 1: A better quality Community Nursing Service
 Priority 2: Integration across Health and Social Care
 Priority 3: An enhanced Care Co-ordination Centre
 Priority 4: Utilisation of alternative levels of care
 Priority 5: A Better governance framework
- 2014/15 Progress and Issues
 New Service model agreed for Community Nursing
 Locality Nursing Teams serving GP practice populations
 Extended Care Co-ordination Centre hours to 24/7
 Development of the supported discharge care pathway
 Reconfiguration of the Community Unit to support frail elderly
 Discharge to assess (D2A) Care Pathway for CHC patients
 Commissioning of specialised nursing home beds for D2A and winter
 New governance framework in place for Community Health Services

2015/16 Proposals

- Development of locality based Health and Social Care Teams
- Development of an Integrated Rapid Response Service
- Integration of the Care Co-ordination Centre with Rothercare
- Introduction of integrated telehealth and telecare packages

- Extend use of Care Co-ordination Centre to support case management
- Clarify arrangements for medical cover in alternative levels of care
- Primary care engagement in performance management framework

2014/15 Progress and Issues Emergency Centre

- Governance structure for project management in place
- Service model designed and work underway to establish patient flow pathways
- Capital development designed and planning permission approved. Capital scheme proposed includes adaptations to the existing A&E department at a cost of £12M
- External review from the Emergency Care Intensive Support Team
Service model was innovative, safe, provided a quality service to Rotherham residents and made the best use of resources
Review of workforce to staff the Service model undertaken for each of the scenarios which may prevail
- Finance and contracting discussions ongoing
- Draft IT service specification being firmed up
- Business case for approval
TRFT Board – 31st October, 2014
CCG Governing Body – 5th November, 2014

2015/16 Proposals/Next Steps

- Agree finance and contracting arrangements
- Commence with capital development
- Continue service model development – testing out pathways at simulation events and ratifying via CRMC and MH QUIPP group
- Develop pathway back to GP practices and implement
- Procure, develop and implement IT system
- Implement workforce development strategy to move away from reliance on locum cover
- Develop clear transition arrangements and monitor progress
- Robust strategy on culture change to be developed and implemented
- Establish regular clinician to clinician meetings
- Implement communications strategy (a) public campaign (b) internal communications across organisations

Maximise Partnerships and Primary Care

- Better Care Fund – incorporating GP Case Management and additional investment in care outside hospital
- To effectively align secondary and primary care plans with NHS England (co-commissioning of Primary Care and specialised services)
- To deliver ‘working together’ in collaboration with other CCGs

Better Care Fund (BCF)

2014/15 Progress

- No new money

- £23M total fund (13.5M Health/£9.5M Local Authority) to a single pooled budget for Health and Social Care Services to work more closely together supporting Adult Social Care Services
- 15 agreed schemes within the plan
- BCG plan contributed to 4 of the strategic outcomes of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- Rotherham recognised as 1 of the top 15 plans nationally
- On track for the resubmission of plans by 19th September
- BCF now incorporated the schemes from the investment in care outside hospital

2014/15 Issues

- Nationally expected to see a 3.5% decrease in non-elective admissions within the plan – Rotherham's ambition was 0% as a result of the significant reduction (10%) over the last few years
- Nationally expect 'benefits' to be attributable to BCF – but BCF was 1 part of the overall commissioning plan and needed to ensure the picture was not 'skewed'
- Capacity to deliver on the 15 agreed schemes and to meet ongoing reporting requirements
- The second evaluation event for the additional investment in care outside hospital was arranged for 22nd October. As part of BCF, continuation of funding was a joint decision, the main criteria for evaluation was to demonstrate impact on hospital admissions

2015/16 Proposals

- Implement the revised plan agreed and submitted on 19th September
- Continue to work in partnership with RMBC
- Agree realistic timescales for the 15 schemes and ensure capacity to deliver

GP Case Management

2014/15 Progress

- Currently 6,687 active care plans
- 35 out of 36 practices were signed up
- Inclusion of 75 and over health check – 1,410 completed

2014/15 Issues

- Range of uptake across Rotherham from 0.1% to 5%
- Capacity of practices to deliver this
- 35 different methods of delivery – wide disparity in uptake of supporting services
- Complexity of IT systems to support

2015/15 GP Case Management

- Continued funding of the service for at least 5 years with possible amendments to how it was delivered
- Annual evaluation

Align Secondary and Primary Care Plans with NHS England (co-commissioning of Primary Care and Specialised Services)

2014/15 Proposals

- NHS England have asked CCGs to express interest in co-commissioning Primary Care
- It was also expected that CCGs would be asked to take a greater role for the commissioning of some specialised services

2014/15 Issues

- Should we move towards being a 'one' place commissioner
- Finances would need to be delegated to CCGs from NHS England
- CCG would need to review staffing structures and governance arrangement if it wished to proceed with co-commissioning

2015/16 Proposals

- The CCG proposed to co-commission Primary Care as from 1st April, 2015
- Further information regarding specialised co-commissioning was expected from NHS England in October, 2014

Deliver 'Working Together' in collaboration with other CCGs

2014/15 Progress

- 8 CCGs and the Area Team as commissioners of Primary Care and Specialised Services had initiated a programmed of work to collaborate on key priorities (smaller specialities, paediatrics, stroke)
- SYCOM agreed a Project Initiation Document in February, 2014 and programme director recruited in April, 2014 to work with each commissioning partners
- Project Initiation Documents had been agreed for 3 of the 4 clinical priorities
- Good progress made to date with 3 of the 4 workstreams
- Following agreement to take forward the Children's workstream jointly with provider colleagues, a joint document had been produced which would be shared and discussed at the joint meeting on 5th September

2014/15 Issues

- Identify shared resources to deliver projects between CCGs
- The Out of Hospital workstream had been placed on hold pending further details of Phase Two of the National Urgent Care Review

2015/16 Proposals

- Over the next we months to continue to deliver the 4 agreed key priorities:
 - Acute Children Services
 - Acute Cardiology and Stroke Services
 - Smaller Specialities (Speciality Collaborative)
 - Out of Hospital (currently on hold)

Discussion ensued with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Regular updates would be presented to the Select Commission on the Urgent Care Centre which was currently anticipated to open in 2 years
- It was the intention to enhance Community Services and keep/treat patients in the community as long as possible to prevent hospital admissions
- The presentation was a refresh of the proposals presented last year, not new proposals, and comments could be fed in via the link in the presentation
- 2015/15 would see a continued emphasis on working together across South Yorkshire, Bassetlaw and North Derbyshire to deliver the 4 key agreed priorities i.e. Acute Children's Services, Acute Cardiology and Stroke Services, smaller Specialities and Out of Hospital (currently on hold due to the National Urgent Care Review).
- The provision would still be at Rotherham Hospital but would be a mix of clinicians from across the region. It was the desire to maintain services in Rotherham wherever possible unless there was a clinical reason not to. The provider had to make efficiencies but in a way that did not have a detrimental effect on the patients
- Proposed event in December, 2014, at the New York Stadium where clinicians would give updates on the Working Together schemes – invitations to Members to follow
- Business cases for the proposals were not complete as yet but any that involved major service change would be submitted to the Select Commission and Patient Groups for comment
- One area being considered was the overnight rotas for on-call consultants as this was very costly
- Business cases were being led by clinicians and would have patient care as an absolute priority
- Smaller specialties were discussed with emergency eye trauma given as an example - low admissions in Rotherham averaging two per week.
- Concentrating experienced clinicians tended to lead to better outcomes.
- The refresh took into account the Health and Wellbeing Strategy (underpinned by the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment), reflected the needs of the clinicians, the views of the public and mindful of national guidance and mandate
- The first draft of the 2015/16 refresh would be complete by December and a second draft in the New Year once the NHS financial guidance had been received. It would be submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board in February, 2015
- Rotherham's Social Prescribing had been highlighted by the NHS as best direction of travel
- Further information would be submitted in due course regarding NHS England's intention for CCGs to take on a greater role on the co-commissioning of some specialised services and primary care
- The place based plan for GPs and primary care was important and should reflect the Access to GPs Scrutiny Review, building in the recommendations made

- The existing 5 year plan did not contain great detail on specialised commissioning or on Primary Care commissioning as they currently sat with NHS England. Discussions were ongoing as to whether those services were to be directed back to CCGs and if so would necessitate a change in the CCG's constitution and greater involvement of lay members to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Resourcing would also be an issue

Chris, Robin and Lydia were thanked for their attendance.

Resolved:- (1) That the presentation be noted.

(2) That the CCG's commitment for further engagement with the Select Commission be noted.

52. UPDATE ON SCRUTINY REVIEW - HOSPITAL DISCHARGES

Further to Minute No. 42 of 12th September, 2013, Michaela Cox, Service Manager, and Maxine Dennis, RFT, presented an update on the action plan in response to the recommendations arising from the spotlight review that had taken place in 2013.

The recommendations had been welcomed and addressed through effective joint work between NHS Rotherham and the Council with good progress having been made in addressing the recommendations.

The potential for unsafe discharges had reduced. The Care Co-ordination Centre and the Hospital had done a lot of work on managing how it planned and co-ordinated discharge including talking and having written communication to both patients and carers about predicted date of discharge.

An update on the actions was appended to the report the majority of which were now complete. Maxine highlighted the following:-

- In 2013 there were approximately 75,000 attendees at the Emergency Department every year together with 70-75,000 admissions both elective and non-elective. To put into context there had been 33 complaints regarding delayed discharges in 2013/14 and 49 in 2012/13
- The Trust was in the process of, through work with the Emergency Care and Intensive Support Team, implementing SAFER Care Bundle which had addressed some concerns. It pre-empted discharge problems and involved talking to patients about their predicted date of discharge and having written communication with patients and relatives. It had already been implemented on the Medical Wards
- The Community Transformation Programme was under way
- A report on the Care Co-ordination Centre and the Supported Discharge Service, which included an assessment tool for risk of hospital admission, was being compiled

- The hospital and patient agreed a time for a post discharge follow up call within 72 hours of discharge
- Out of 70 patients discharged only 2 had been re-admitted
- The Care Co-ordination Centre worked until 10.00 p.m. with some cover at weekends. It was hoped to run it 24 hours a day as it was a good single point of access.
- The Operational Discharges Group had now been replaced by a Forum that met 3 times a week including Hospital and Social Services colleagues to review delayed discharges and operational issues. Continuing Health Care colleagues joined the Forum once a week. Currently developing a Discharge to Assess model which would support earlier discharge whilst ensuring a robust assessment process. There were a number of patients in hospital who required a complex assessment process prior to discharge. A pilot was to be launched of 14 beds in the community where the patients could go whilst the assessment process was completed rather than stay in hospital. Patient choice is important as choices can effectively be rest of life choices.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be noted.

(2) That a further update, including details of the Community Transformation Programme, be submitted in January, 2015,

(3) That the following information be submitted to Members:

- Up-to-date figures for delayed discharges and complaints relating to discharges
- Report on Care Co-ordination Centre
- Information about the SAFER care bundle

53. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD - MAKING EVERY CONTACT COUNT

Dr. John Radford, Director of Public Health, presented an overview of the Making Every Contact Council (MECC) initiative.

MECC had been discussed at the Health and Wellbeing Board and, although partners agreed in principle with the concept, actual engagement with and tangible implementation had been disappointing.

The approach to MECC was currently subject to review and alternative strategies to engage partnership organisations considered. Discussion ensued on the approach and the resources required to promote MECC and whether it was viable:-

- In principle it was a great idea that whilst in hospital or your path crossed with any health care worker you would be spoken to about any issues that affected your health and possible interventions

- It had been hoped to integrate the initiative into an employee's training (health and social care) and, although that had not happened in a system-wide approach, it did not mean that it did not take place, but there were not the resources to ensure that it did
- It would require 2-3 members of staff dedicated to producing a framework that could be used to persuade organisations to implement the initiative
- Asking someone who was visiting/treating a client/patient to engage in MECC would cut into the time allocated for that person so it needed to be a proportionate response
- A lot was being done in this regard through NHS Healthchecks (see below)
- Hard evidence was required as to what the actual benefits of MECC were, including examples of effectiveness elsewhere
- Need to engage commissioners to understand there would be additional resources required to deliver the initiative
- Resources were also required to collate the information once it was gathered in order to measure the scheme's impact, which could lead to a danger of it becoming a "tick box" exercise
- Safeguarding concerns for both adults and children should be reported/identified by staff as a matter of course in their professional roles

Resolved:- That information be provided following the current review of the approach to MECC for consideration by the commission

54. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD STRATEGY PROGRESS - PREVENTION AND EARLY INTERVENTION - NHS HEALTH CHECKS

Dr. John Radford, Director of Public Health, gave the following powerpoint presentation:-

- Risk Assessment
 - Cardio Vascular Disease (CVD)
 - Type 2 Diabetes
- Risk Communication
- Risk Management
 - Lifestyle advice
 - Referral for behaviour modification
 - Prescribing

Our Objective

- Screen 18% of eligible 20% of population annually
- Challenge to deliver this in the most deprived communities

Lipid Modification NICE 2014

- Systematic approach 40-74
- QRISK2
- Ethnicity, BMI, family history

- High intensity statin for risk conditions with 10% risk
- High intensity 20 mg atorvastatin for primary prevention

Diet

- Reduce saturated fats
- Replace saturated fats with olive oil and rapeseed oil
- Reduce refined sugar and fructose
- Fruit and vegetables whole grains
- 2 portions of fish
- Signpost to NHS Choices

Exercise

- High risk CVD 30 minutes of at least moderate activity daily
- If unable to do this offer exercise to maximum capacity
- Recommended physical activity could be built into daily living
- Additive 10 minutes or more accumulated as effective as longer sessions

Q Risk 2

- Age
- Gender
- Smoker
- Premature family CVD
- Hypertension treatment
- Social deprivation
- Total HDL cholesterol
- Ethnicity
- Rheumatoid
- Chronic Kidney Disease
- AF

Risk Communication

- Individual risk and benefit
- Numerical presentation
- Signpost to appropriate information
- Feelings and beliefs
- Readiness to change lifestyle
- Shared management plan
- Check what had been discussed

Discussion ensued on the presentation with the following issues raised/clarified:-

- Health Checks were aimed at everyone over the age of 45 years and were repeated every 5 years
- It gave the opportunity to assess lifestyle and risk of heart disease/stroke and offer interventions for that risk

- Since Public Health had joined the Council there had been a 30% increase in the number of health checks undertaken
- A promotion programme would run from January, 2015
- The prescribing of Statins could greatly reduce mortality from chronic heart disease
- The participation rates at GP practices varied across the Borough
- Stress and anxiety were not specifically included in possible causes of Q Risk 2 which were drawn up many years ago. Social deprivation had been added as a means of acknowledging that if you were in control of your life you were less stressed
- Timing of interventions and the life course approach of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy
- The importance of winning “hearts and minds”

Resolved:- (1) That the presentation be noted.

(2) That Select Commission Members consider ways to champion and publicise NHS healthchecks, for example through town and parish council magazines.

(3) That details of the current membership of the following working groups be provided at the next meeting - Obesity Strategy Group, Rotherham Heart Town, Tobacco Control Alliance and the Self-Harm and Suicide Prevention Group.

55. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 4th December, 2014, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

**SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
23rd October, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); Councillors Cutts, Ellis, Reeder, Sharman, Smith, Wallis, Watson and Whelbourn.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors McNeely Smith and Wallis.

Councillor Roche, Adviser, Children and Education Services was in attendance for item 33 regarding the Safeguarding Children and Families' Services focus, on behalf of the Cabinet Member for Children and Education Services. Councillor J. Hamilton and Ahmed of the Improving Lives Select Commission had given their apologies for this item.

29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No Declarations of Interest were made.

30. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no members of the public or the press in attendance.

31. COMMUNICATIONS

Nothing was raised under this item.

32. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH SEPTEMBER, 2014

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission held on 18th September, 2014, were considered.

Under Minute No. 27 (Complaints – annual report - April 2013 – March 2014) discussion continued on the classification of complaints and issues arising from Councillors' surgeries. How were these recorded – were they surgeries or complaints? If they were not recorded as complaints the data about complaints was incomplete. Very often Councillors resolved issues at surgery level which could well have been reported through the complaints process. Consideration needed to be given to how the constituent bringing the issue to the surgery wanted it to be recorded – either as a complaint or as a surgery request. Data was collected both on complaints and on service requests.

Councillor Whelbourn asked for clarification on whether the paper-based complaints forms had been withdrawn and how Elected Members could report complaints reported at their surgeries.

Resolved: - (1) That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

(2) That a response be provided to Councillor Whelbourn regarding methods for reporting complaints.

33. REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31ST AUGUST 2014

Councillor S. Currie, Chair of the Self-Regulation Select Commission, introduced Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, Joanne Robertson, CYPS and Schools' Finance Manager (Financial Services, Resources Directorate), and Paul Dempsey, Service Manager for Family Placements and Residential (Safeguarding Children and Families' Services, Children and Young People's Services Directorate).

The Director of Finance presented the submitted report on budget monitoring information for the period ending 31st August, 2014, for the first five months of the 2014/2015 financial year. This had been considered at the Cabinet Meeting that had been held on 15th October, 2014 (Minute No. C73 refers).

Overall, the Council was forecast to over-spend on the 2014/2015 Revenue Budget by £3.105millions. This represented an increase of 1.5% against the total budget. The main reasons for the overspend related to continuing service demand and cost pressures for safeguarding vulnerable children and young people across the Borough, cost pressures relating from some schools converting to academies, income pressures within the Economic and Development Services Directorate and ICT department, and demand pressures for Direct Payments within older people and physical and sensory disability clients.

Other information included: -

- 44 employees had been approved to access voluntary early retirement/voluntary severance, and 34 applications were currently being considered. Savings arising from the approved applications had been reflected in the forecast outturn position;
- The Chief Executive had used his delegated authority to implement a moratorium on non-essential spend;
- There were a small number of historic recurrent budget pressures across the Council where permission had been sought for a permanent budget virement to address these;
- Revenue staff savings from the day of industrial action that had taken place on 10th July, 2014, had amounted to £86,000 and had been used to reduce staff cost pressures;
- Continued close management of spend remained essential if the Council was to deliver a balanced outturn, in-year financial performance and overall financial resilience;
- It was forecast that the budgeted levels of Council Tax and Business rates would be achieved;
- The agency, consultancy and non-contractual overtime costs for each Directorate were considered at their outturn for the 2013/2014

financial year, and a comparison of spend at August 2013 and August 2014 was supplied. Overall, all spends as at August 2014 were lower than the same point in 2013.

The submitted report provided information about the annual budget allocation for 2014/2015 for each Directorate/Service and the Housing Revenue Account, their projected outturn and the forecast variation after actions. A commentary was also provided that outlined the reasons for the variations against annual budget at appendix one.

The submitted report outlined the proposals that the Cabinet had accepted to allow the £1.4 million under-spend from the voluntary early retirement and voluntary severance budget. The virements to Services were outlined along with why they were necessary: -

- £700k recurrent ICT income pressure;
- £97k to address the forecast recurrent income pressure in Parking Services;
- £437k to address the non-delivery of corporate commissioning savings targets set in the previous years;
- £166k to address previous years' unrealisable income targets associated with proposed Housing related customer service developments;
- The balance of the uncommitted budget on the Central Services Local Investment budget totalling £120k to provide additional support services for victims, families and those impacted by Child Sexual Exploitation as announced by the Leader of the Council.

Discussion followed on the issue of the virements / realignments: -

Q: - Councillor Currie asked whether the virements were one-offs or recurring?

A: - The pressures were recurring so the realignment has been agreed permanently.

Q: - Councillor Whelbourn asked whether there was a virement policy? Virements did not happen regularly as some budget allocations had remained unchanged for years.

A: - Yes. Rotherham had a virement policy as part of the organisation's Financial Regulations that were annually reviewed by the Audit Team.

Q: - Councillor Ellis referred to the different references to Parking Services within the report. The Service had received a virement of funding because of £97k recurrent income pressure which the report attributed to the new Tesco's store. How was this a recurrent income pressure when the new Tesco's was yet to open?

A: - The wording here should be sharper, the reference was related to historic income pressures and further income pressures were forecast for the future when the new Tesco's store opened.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked whether the free weekend parking that had been approved for the 2014 festive period had been forecasted? This had agreed an extra £10k pressure on an already pressurised budget.

A: - The festive free parking had not been forecast in this budget monitoring report.

Councillor Ellis referred to the wording of the report that was more appropriate to when it was considered by Cabinet regarding the decisions to be made.

A: - The wording of the recommendations were clear that the Self-Regulation Select Commission was being asked to note the decisions made by the Cabinet in relation to the 31st August, 2014 budget monitoring report.

Paul Dempsey, Service Manager for Family Placements and Residential, was welcomed to the meeting. Paul had attended on behalf of Jane Parfremment, Director for Safeguarding, Children and Families' Services, who would be invited to a future meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission. Paul had been invited to the meeting to discuss the revenue budget overspends in relation to out-of-authority residential placements (+£2.528 million) and the provision of independent foster carer placements (+£221k) and the ways that the Directorate was working to reduce spend.

Q: - Councillor Currie asked about how the overspend compared to previous years, had the various Invest to Save initiatives made any differences and were any others planned? Was Rotherham looking towards best practice from other local authorities with similar resources and needs but who had better Ofsted ratings?

A: - Rotherham had significantly increased their numbers of in-house foster carers over the past three years. The Local Authority had 185 in-house foster carers in 2014/2015, compared to 165 in 2013/2014. In-house placements were more cost effective at a cost of £266 per week compared to an independent placement cost of £885 per week. The numbers of children placed in independent fostering placements had reduced by 19 placements over the year. These actions were for cost avoidance and the CYPs Directorate and Department would continue to pursue these.

Continuing work would be focused on recruiting more carers for adolescents with challenging and complex needs; the 'Fostering Plus' initiative was investing additional monies in paying higher fees to carers, which would avoid external out of the Borough provision being used.

Rotherham and Sheffield were collaborating on joint provision for children who had been sexually exploited and children at risk of sexual exploitation.

Rotherham had accessed a temporary Fostering Reform Grant of around £900k and used this to increase capacity in the staffing team which had maintained fostering and adoption statistics. Rotherham approved 18 adopters in 2012/2013 and had increased to 31 in 2013/2014. It worked with other local authorities and voluntary sector organisations to identify external adoptive placements at cost of £27k. In 2013/2014 Rotherham bought 27 placements. In 2014/2015 it was forecasting to purchase no more than 20. Through the increased capacity, Rotherham was able to sell more adoptive placements at a cost of £27k per placement.

A review of Residential Services and provision had been undertaken at the Silverwood Residential Home that aimed to return children to Rotherham who were currently placed outside of the Borough at lower cost and improved outcomes.

Q: - Councillor Sharman referred to the bigger picture of all of the Services for vulnerable children and young people. Were the problems highlighted in the Jay Report a consequence of budget failure or a cause of budget failure in the future? Elected Members needed to keep a focus on this in the coming years.

A: - Councillor Currie confirmed that the scrutiny function in Rotherham would consider the implications and recommendations of the Jay Report and how the response would be budgeted for.

A: - The Director for Finance explained that, in the past, Rotherham had invested approximately £8.5 million in its Children's Services. It had originally been in the lower quartile of funding for childrens' services but was currently placed above the median. However, whether the budget was at the right level would need to be continually examined. It would continue to be managed as a corporate entity.

Q: - Councillor Ellis was pleased that reference to the Jay report had been included. At a Members' Seminar facilitated by the Police that took place yesterday, the Chief Constable had shared detailed victim support analysis that had been discussed with the Home Secretary for the short, medium and long-term. The plan referred to Council, NHS and Police funding being utilised. Who had been involved from the Council and were the victim support cost requirements included in this budget monitoring report?

A: - The Director for Finance had not personally been involved in these discussions but understood that multi-agency conversations had taken place. He did not have access to any further details.

Q: - Councillor Ellis explained that she would be disappointed if not all stakeholders had been involved in these discussions and felt that the monetary response needed to be correct from the outset to ensure it was accurate and addressed needs appropriately.

Q: - Councillor Currie asked about the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Panel, was it working and had it been evaluated?

A: - The Multi-Agency Safeguarding Panel was the legal gateway for Court proceedings to bring children into care. The Director of Safeguarding Children and Families had to ensure that social work teams were being proactive in looking for other solutions, including extended family members to ensure the best outcomes for children and young people and also work cost effectively.

Rotherham's costs were higher than national average. They would be brought down through the use of more in-house provision.

Q: - Councillor Currie asked how care requirements were forecast?

A: - Forecasts were based on the current picture and took local intelligence into consideration.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked what the average cost of an in-house placement was?

A: - The average cost was £830 per week and represented a mix of fostering and residential provision, the same calculation in Rotherham cost £880 per week.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked whether the costs of Invest to Save programmes had been recovered yet? Had the original investment been re-paid?

A: - The information was not available at this meeting but would be considered at the meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission that the Director for Safeguarding Children and Families attended.

Q: - Councillor Currie asked how the Local Authority ensured that the interventions of other agencies were effective and had they worked? What criteria were they reviewed by?

A: - Assessment on whether needs had been met was considered and also whether children and young people were progressing. Statutory child care reviews for children in care were undertaken by Independent Reviewing Officers. Where commissioned services were in place a dispute process existed. The White Rose Consortium had a quality assurance framework and Rotherham did not place children with providers unless they were rated as Good or Outstanding.

Delivering the Budget Savings 2014/2015: -

The Financial Services Director gave a short presentation on the progress towards achieving budget savings in the 2014/2015 budget. He reported on an exceptions basis where it was believed that savings would not be met against the requirement to make budget savings proposals of £14.419million.

- Savings that been rated as being 'not delivered/not forecast to be delivered' totalled £1.154million. This risk had been red-rated;
- The savings proposed by the Special Educational Needs and Disability Service would not achieve £200k of the suggested £600k saving due in part of increasing numbers of complex cases across the Borough, pressures due to individualised budgets and increasing placement costs. The Head of Service was due to present a report to the Rotherham Schools' Forum at the end of November on this;
- Legal and Democratic Services were projecting to deliver 50% of the savings put forward from a range of smaller scale proposals;
- Adult social care were projecting to not make a proposed saving of £500k across two proposals.

Q: - Councillor Currie asked about ongoing savings being made by Corporate Commissioning. Actual savings were not matching targets.

A: - Corporate Commissioning was on target to deliver current savings, historic savings were not projected to meet target.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked for an update to be provided to the next meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission regarding the failure to make £500k of savings in Adult Services and the reasons why this was the case.

A: - The Service Director would be invited to the next meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission.

Some savings had been delivered or delivered by alternative means and had been rated as green: -

- CYPS Business support;
- Waste disposal contracts;
- Estates.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked for further information about how the Services had been able to meet the savings by alternative means and whether scrutiny would be required to measure the impact the savings had made and the impact on the areas that had not made their proposed savings to explore the reasons why this was the case.

A: - Service specialists and Service Accountants had checked the viability of proposed savings. Where they had not been met/could not be met alternative means had been sought.

Q: - Councillor Watson asked for future meetings to focus on car parking costs as an additional £10k of budget pressures had been taken on. A meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission in the early New Year, 2015, should call the Cabinet Member for Business Growth and Regeneration to give evidence about whether the policy had increased footfall and revenue for the town centre businesses.

Q: - Councillor Watson referred to the agency, consultation and non-contractual overtime section of the report. How were these expected to be addressed?

A: - It was expected that the budget would outturn at a lower level than the previous year. Spend under this budget was covered by the moratorium on non-essential spend.

Q: - Councillor Ellis noted that EDS and CYPS agency costs had been used for the provision of staff cover. Was sickness absence increasing? At a time of a reducing resources and workforce pressure on staff members was increasing and needed to remain on a watching brief.

A: - The Director of Human Resources would be asked to confirm the position on this and information would be brought back to the Self-Regulation Select Commission if sickness absence rates were rising.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked about the process to initiate the non-essential spend moratorium, was it correct that it was done through the Chief Executive's Delegated Powers?

A: - The power to do this existed in the budget strategy and the timing of the Moratorium coincided with the August recess period. The matter was considered to be urgent enough to utilise Delegated Powers.

Q: - Councillor Ellis raised that non-essential spend meant different things in different areas/Directorates. Where did the policy to offer free car parking at weekends over the festive period stand in terms of non-essential spend? It contributed to a loss of income that created pressures elsewhere.

A: - The Director of Finance confirmed that budget holders were receiving daily reports on all spending within the budgets that they managed and were able to challenge and scrutinise all items to ensure that all spending was essential. The Purchase 2 Pay Service was also ensuring that all orders were essential and represented value for money.

Received: - (1) That the current forecast outturn and the continuing financial challenge for the Council to deliver a balanced revenue budget for 2014/2015 be noted.

(2) That the Self-Regulation Select Commission note the decision of the Cabinet to approve budget virements as set out at section 7.4 of the submitted report.

(3) That the Self-Regulation Select Commission note the decision of the Cabinet to utilise the revenue savings from the day of industrial action to reducing staffing cost pressures within the overall Council over-spend.

(4) That a copy of the Virement Policy be forwarded to all members of the Self-Regulation Select Commission.

(5) That the budget implications from the Jay Report be considered by the Self-Regulation Select Commission at an early opportunity.

(6) That a copy of the Head of Special Educational Needs and Disability Service's report be circulated to the Self-Regulation Select Commission when it was published.

(7) That the Director for Health and Wellbeing attend the next meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission to discuss the likely non-realisation of two budget saving proposals totalling £500k.

(8) That future scrutiny of the budget monitoring process include reference to the income pressures of the car parking service and the impact that sickness absence may have on the use of agency and non-contractual overtime spend.

34. CAPITAL PROGRAMME MONITORING 2014/15 AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME BUDGET 2015/16 TO 2016/17

The Director for Finance presented a report that provided the Capital Programme Budget Monitoring report for 2014/2015 and an outline for the Capital Programme Budgets for 2015/2016 and 2016/2017.

The forecast outturn for the 2014/2015 budget included the 2014/2015 revised estimate, the variance from the last report, the 2015/2016 estimate, the 2015/2016 variance from the last report, the 2016/2017 estimate and the 2016/2017 variance from the last report for the Council's four Directorates.

The submitted report provided commentary on how each Directorate was using their capital funding during 2014/2015. The Director of Finance explained the role of the officer group in scrutinising and accepting or rejecting new applications for capital funding.

The Director of Finance reported that there had been slippage on the new teaching block at Wickersley School and Sports College and the new Central Primary School and areas of the Environment and Development Services.

Discussion ensued on the £600k of grant funding that had been received in 2014/2015 in order to meet the Government's requirement to provide universal Free School Meals to all infant-aged school children. The funding was being spent on capital works to kitchens including extensions and new kitchen equipment. The Self-Regulation Select Commission requested more information about this process and whether it was due to complete on-time and on budget.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked for more information about the occupancy rate of the Borough's business investment units.

A: - These were managed by the Council's Asset Management Service who worked to attract international interest and investment in the Borough. If occupancy rates were starting to drop, or if there were good news stories it would be reflected in income monitoring reports. The Service needed to ensure that it had available capacity to respond to new enquiries.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That the Council's decision to approve the updated 2014/2015 to 2016/2017 capital programme budget be noted.

(3) That further information be requested in relation to the capital programme around the requirement to deliver universal Free School Meals for infant-aged school children.

35. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Self-Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday 27th November, 2014, to start at 3.30 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
Wednesday, 5th November, 2014

Present:- Councillor J. Hamilton (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Astbury, Buckley, Burton, Reynolds, Roddison and Turner. Co-opted member Mr. M. Smith (Children and Young People's Voluntary Sector Consortium) was also in attendance.

Councillor Doyle was in attendance for the items regarding Domestic Abuse as they related to his portfolio area.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clark, N. Hamilton and McNeely, and from co-opted member Mrs. A. Clough (Rotherham Older Peoples' Forum).

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

No Declarations of Interest were made.

28. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS.

There were no members of the public or the press in attendance.

29. COMMUNICATIONS.

Nothing was raised under this item.

30. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17TH SEPTEMBER, 2014.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 17th September, 2014, were discussed.

Resolved: - That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as an accurate record.

31. REPRESENTATIVE AND SUBSTITUTE FROM THE IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION TO THE HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY PANEL.

Resolved: - (1) That Councillor A. Buckley be confirmed as the Improving Lives Select Commission's representative to the Health, Welfare and Safety Panel.

(2) That Councillor J. Hamilton be confirmed as his substitute.

32. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION'S SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOMESTIC ABUSE - PROPOSED REVIEW OF LOCAL RESPONSES TO "HONOUR" BASED VIOLENCE AND FORCED MARRIAGE.

Councillor J. Hamilton, Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission, welcomed Cheryl Henry-Leach, Domestic Abuse Officer, Jan Bean, Safeguarding Adults and Domestic Abuse Manager (Health and Wellbeing, Neighbourhood and Adult Services Directorate) and Zalakia Ahmed, Apna Haq. They had attended to give a presentation on the issues around so-called 'honour-based violence' and forced marriage. This was to enable the Improving Lives Select Commission to consider how it should undertake a scrutiny review into the issues.

A previous scrutiny review into Domestic Abuse had been undertaken by the Improving Lives Select Commission and presented to the Cabinet on 6th November, 2013. Minute No. C111 refers.

Work to tackle so-called 'honour-based' violence and forced marriage was led by the Safer Rotherham Partnership through the Domestic Abuse Priority Group. This was in-line with the national Violence Against Women Campaign that the Central Government led.

A presentation was delivered by the Domestic Abuse Officer. Issues covered included: -

- A definition of Domestic Abuse;
- There was no legal move to change the term "honour". The concept varied between different individuals and groups;
- Illustrated the differences between forced marriages and arranged marriages;
- Arranged marriages could become forced marriages if one partner subsequently withdrew their consent;
- There had been a slight increase from 2008/2009 – when 1,200 incidents were reported to 1,500 in 2012/2013;
- Majority of victims were female. 31% were in the 18-21 age bracket;
- Domestic Abuse training was refreshed in 2013;
- In March, 2014, the Young Person's Advocacy programme was adopted.

Three case studies were shared that illustrated the different types of forced marriage that could take place and the responses of agencies following referrals. Discussion was undertaken on forced marriage and the impact it had on children and young people.

Questions were asked if partners such as the Police, routinely attended key strategy meetings and Members of the Improving Lives Select Commission expressed concerns if this was not the case. Officers in attendance confirmed that the expectation was that all Partners must

attend when called to Strategy meetings. When this was found not to be the case it was challenged at a strategic level.

Discussion also covered: -

- What support was available for children and young people who wanted to report their concerns about being subject to a forced marriage? It could be very difficult for children to accuse their parents, as they loved them. What could the Local Authority and partners do to ensure help was available? - It was highlighted that the delivery of training on behalf of the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board was always full to capacity. Positive work had also been undertaken with Mosques. However, Apna Haq raised issues about potential gaps in awareness raising in schools suggesting that it was not provided on a consistent basis.
- What exercises were undertaken to ensure that gaps were identified? – The legal change around domestic abuse had helped with the recording and analysis of forced marriage and so called “honour-based” violence. The family’s history needed to be considered when assessing future risks. It was difficult to ascertain an accurate picture of the extent of forced marriage within Rotherham because of under-reporting.
- Rotherham’s Elected Members had attended a police training session on CSE. Councillor Reynolds explained how he had asked whether the Chief Superintendent for South Yorkshire was confident that he had the resources to effectively police the issue. He did not confirm this was the case and it was an area of concern to Councillor Reynolds. - Statutory Guidance was clear that if the child was under the age of 18 the response would be led by Children’s Services. If a specialist response was required Apna Haq would be approached.
- Councillor Turner was aware of cultural differences and expectations. If a young person reported any issues related to domestic abuse it would be taken seriously. Different cultural and traditional norm were respected but we have to place victims’ safety first. There was the statutory obligation to prevent a domestic homicide. Apna Haq worked with and supported migrant communities and British Asian communities.
- The importance of independent, confidential and safe areas where reporting could take place was discussed.
- The provision of information to Elected Members was considered. It was noted that the Cabinet received a quarterly update from the Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board.

It was agreed by all in attendance that a scrutiny review focused on forced marriage and so-called “honour-based” violence and in particular how agencies responded to these issues given the legal changes recently introduced. This would be scheduled to take place in the spring of 2015. The members of the Improving Lives Select Commission supported the commencement of the review as quickly as possible.

Councillor Hamilton thanked the Officers in attendance for their presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - (1) That the responses to so-called “honour-based” violence and forced marriage be noted.

(2) That a scrutiny review on so-called “honour-based” violence and forced marriage take place from spring, 2015.

33. IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION'S SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOMESTIC ABUSE - UPDATE TO RESPONSE PRESENTED IN NOVEMBER, 2013.

Councillor Hamilton welcomed Chrissy Wright, Strategic Commissioning Manager and the interim chair of the Domestic Abuse Priority Group. Chrissy had attended the meeting in relation to the Scrutiny Review of Domestic Abuse that had been undertaken by the Improving Lives Select Commission and accepted by Cabinet on 5th February, 2014. Minute no. C176 refers.

Action plan comprised of 20 items. It was a substantial piece of work for the operational teams to take forward. The Cabinet’s response to the Scrutiny Review of Domestic Abuse was considered, along with an update that was current as of 5th November, 2014.

Questions asked included: -

- The impact of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH) – this was still in its early days. Benchmarking with other Local Authority’s had taken place and the use of a MASH had enabled prevention and disruption activity to prevent Domestic Abuse;
- How were partners and the Vulnerable Person’s Unit working together and had there been training for staff? – Again, it was early days for the co-location of the VPU, the PPU and the Contact and Referral Team (CART). Anecdotally, teams did appear to be communicating better and sharing intelligence;
- What finance and investment was required? – There had been recruitment to two further posts through contingency funding;
- Had any recommendations stalled? - Any not complete were in progress. All recommendations were on a timeline to be completed by March 2015;
- Funding bids had been turned down? - A detailed response as to why the bid had not been successful had been received and the

Local Authority was looking for similar monies that could be bid for to pursue its work with perpetrators;

- Were there strong relationships with the Police and Crime Commissioner's office? - Yes. Future meetings were planned to look at accessing PCC funding;
- Recommendation 14 covered the use of a standard approach and standard risk assessment by all agencies. Were all agencies working towards an agreed and common understanding? – This had been reviewed with the Local Safeguarding Children Board. Pre-birth assessments were not being undertaken as would be expected and clearer guidance had been rolled-out. It would become a Tri.ex document as it currently only existed as a paper document. The Domestic Abuse risk matrix aligned the needs of any child/ren to the adult victim;
- Were services attending the MARAC? - Key partners were attending and were aware that attendance was currently under review;

The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care and Health, who had the issue of Domestic Abuse in his portfolio confirmed how he monitored the issues. Minutes of the meetings came to his Cabinet Member meetings. An initiative coming forward was that Rotherham was working towards the White Ribbon campaign whereby men advocated to other men that abuse against women should not be accepted under any circumstances. All major sports clubs, the Police and the Council in Rotherham had been asked to sign up to it.

Discussion continued: -

- Was there less reporting taking place? – This was being discussed with the Police at a South Yorkshire level. Research was being undertaken through Sheffield Hallam University to look victims' journeys and how supported they had felt. It could be very difficult to secure a conviction of Domestic Abuse;
- How did Rotherham's service compare to others? – The issue of Domestic Abuse was well-owned across the Council, across the Executive and by the Multi-Agency Support Hub.

Councillor Hamilton thanked the Officers for the update presentation and requested an update in six-months' time. Progress so far appeared to be positive and it must be maintained and built upon.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That a further update report on the Improving Lives Select Commission's Scrutiny Review of Domestic Abuse be presented in six-months' time.

34. SAFEGUARDING ADULTS ANNUAL REPORT 2013-2014.

The Safeguarding Adults Manager presented the sixth Safeguarding Adults Annual Report (2013/2014). The Department of Health's 'No Secrets' (2000) document stated that multi-agency management committees should undertake an audit to monitor and evaluation the way in which their policies, procedures and practices for the protection of vulnerable adults.

Rotherham Safeguarding Adults had investigated 314 referrals and 85 people were found to have suffered some form of abuse. 46 as a result of neglect or act of omission, 14 as a result of physical abuse, 13 as a result of institutional abuse, 5 as a result of psychological abuse, 4 as a result of financial abuse and 3 as a result of sexual abuse. Actions had been taken against providers around poor standards of care that resulted in harm.

The report included: -

- The Mission statement;
- Objectives;
- Charter;
- 100% of all alleged abuse reported were responded to within 24 hours;
- The Annual report had been contributed to by the Local Authority, the joint Learning Difficulties and Disability Service, NHS Trust, RDASH, Fire, Police and Voluntary sectors.

Priorities for the coming year included the Care Act (2014), which would be effective from 1st April, 2015.

The data within the report for the period 2013-2014 was discussed: -

- Source of alerts – other Council departments were referring concerns;
- There had been a large reduction in anonymous complaints – It was very difficult to work with an anonymous complaint. When they were informed of the processes and how their concerns will be handled they were usually more confident to put their name forward;
- Training – no members of the Police had taken up training in 2013/2014 – the Police ran their own training scheme;
- Future reports would include information about working with people who did not have the capacity to decide where they should live.

Resolved: - That the Safeguarding Adult Annual Report 2013/2014 be approved with the amendments as suggested to the heading sections.

35. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

The dates of the Select Commission meetings to be held in December may be subject to change.

Resolved: - That the meeting date of the next Improving Lives Select Commission be circulated in due course.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
17th October, 2014

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Currie, J. Hamilton, Parker, Read, Sims, Vines and Watson.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Middleton.

43. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest to report.

44. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

45. TRANSFORMATION CHALLENGE BID

Further to Minute No. C49 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 24th September, 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by Colin Earl, Director of Audit and Asset Management, which detailed how in late April the Government announced the availability of £105m Transformation Challenge Award (TCA) grant and a further £200m capital receipts flexibility. Rotherham submitted an expression of interest to secure £0.7m of grant funding from the TCA programme, which led to an invitation to present a Final bid proposal which was submitted by 1st October, 2014.

The bid proposal would underpin the work of a “single view of a child” integrated data dashboard. The dashboard would provide a holistic view of performance across partners, underpinned by a single view of the child/family and would seek to:-

- Improve the accuracy of information shared.
- Enable partners to share information more effectively and timely.
- Provide one holistic view of the child created by the information held by partner agencies.
- Provide the most up to date information about the child and family.
- Enable visible identification of the child’s and family’s journey and where they were in the process.
- Provide a tool for the collation of partner data and the ability to monitor and manage performance against this data

The Final bid documentation was presented in a prescribed format in which the proposal was structured across five thematic cases (strategic, financial, economic, commercial and management). This presentation was based on the appraisal and evaluation methodology developed by HM Treasury (The Green Book) and included a Cost Benefit Analysis. A draft of the Final Bid Proposal was attached to the report.

The final decision on which schemes would receive funding would be made by the Ministers based on an assessment of whether the bid met the eligibility criteria, the value for money offered by the scheme and whether it was viable and desirable.

Further information was provided on the development of the Multi-Agency Safeguarding Hub (MASH), which would help to bring about positive outcomes for children and young people, their families and carers through a multi-agency approach to referral, decision making, assessment and the provision of services at the right time, in the right place and by the right person.

It would focus on safeguarding children and dealing with domestic abuse. The co-location would enable agencies working with children, young people, their families and carers to work collaboratively to offer a co-ordinated response to families. This would be carried out by agencies collectively assessing need and identifying services from the point of contact, through referral and decision making to the provision of services to safeguard children and support their families. The objective was to provide an improved 'journey' for the child or parent/carer with a greater emphasis on early intervention.

Richard Copley, Corporate ICT Manager, gave a presentation on the Transformation Challenge Award 2014/16 which highlighted information on:-

- The £320 million available for 2014/16.
- The Council's bid and use of capital resources.
- Criteria applied.
- The transforming agenda with local examples.
- Rotherham's bid.
- System concept and the drivers behind the project.
- Project priorities/phases.
- What was the solution to the different solutions.
- Delivery of Rotherham's Single View.
- Children and Young People's Services – Performance Dashboard.
- Rotherham's Single View of a Child.

A number of questions were asked and clarification sought on the benefits of the system, which should eradicate efficiencies in the current system and provide data for all the relevant partners to work together and whether or not partners were also contributing towards the cost.

Members of the Board welcomed this progress and integrated way forward, but suggested there be an overall manager or co-ordinator to bring all the teams together and to avoid a fragmented approach and any risks or likelihood of certain partners not being on board or pitfalls to

system updates. Again it was suggested that there be some kind of Elected Member involvement to oversee and monitor financial and contract progress, possibly via the Self Regulation Select Commission.

Technical questions were asked about the system's operation, the single view of the citizen, the realistic costs involved and the differences between this and the previously abandoned system by the Government in 2011.

The Board were given an assurance about data cleansing and matching with clean data presented back to the sources. It was also noted that if the funding was made available the project would accelerate and be up and running much quicker than was originally planned with clear identification of the economic and social benefits.

Resolved:- (1) That the project proposal, and its implementation subject to approval of the bid, be noted.

(2) That the Cabinet consider the future options, monitoring and governance arrangements and to approve the Self Regulation Select Commission as the monitoring body on a quarterly basis.

46. SCRUTINY REVIEW - HOMELESSNESS: CABINET RESPONSE

Further to Minute No. C74 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 15th October, 2014, consideration was given to the report presented by Sandra Tolley, Housing Options Manager, which detailed the Cabinet response to the Scrutiny Review - Homelessness which was undertaken by Improving Places Select Commission.

The review took place between August, 2013 and January, 2014 and recommendations were considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, at its meeting on 25th April, 2014, and were then reported to Cabinet on 21st May, 2014.

The report was welcomed and provided an opportunity to raise awareness and also explain homelessness procedures.

As the review coincided with the renewal of the Homelessness Strategy 2014 to 2018 most of the recommendations from the review were incorporated into the Homelessness Strategy Action Plan 2014 - 2018.

All of the recommendations were accepted and would continue to be monitored in due course apart from Recommendation No. 3 regarding the option of issuing a newsletter to private sector landlords. It was, therefore, suggested that this be amended to offer an alternative method of communication with private sector landlords as it was anticipated that other methods of communication, i.e. Council website, landlord forums and the landlord accreditation would offer ample opportunities to promote

the benefits of the private rented sector and how they could contribute towards reducing homelessness.

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board sought clarification on the options to address the lack of bed space provision (Recommendation 5) and the actions being taken forward sub-regionally through the Homelessness Forum.

Reference was made to the current Allocations Policy and the absence of information about the most vulnerable people being supported into Council housing stock.

Resolved:- (1) That the response from Cabinet to the Scrutiny Review be received and noted.

(2) That the first monitoring report of the implementation of the review be presented to Improving Places Select Commission in six months' time

47. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were no issues referred by the Area Assemblies.

48. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Caroline Webb, Senior Adviser Scrutiny and Member Development, reported on the manifesto launch by the Youth Cabinet that took place on Thursday, 16th October, 2014.

The Youth Cabinet spoke at length on the work undertaken this year, including the collaboration with the Board around safety and transport, access to Mental Health Services and self harm. An update on the work around self harm would be provided to the Youth Cabinet towards the end of November as part of the Children's Commissioner Day

The Board referred to young people's access to Mental Health Services and the intrinsic role of the School Nurse and how the scrutiny review help to redesign the service. It was also noted that Maltby Academy had their own Mental Health practitioner for young people to access wider Mental Health Services.

The Youth Cabinet indicated their wish going forward to do a piece of work around the lowering of the vote to sixteen year olds, engagement in politics and greater political awareness. It was suggested that this be included as part of the involvement with Children's Commissioner Day, details of which were yet to be confirmed.

The Board expressed their ongoing commitment to working with young people, especially around Children's Commissioner Day and a report would be submitted to the next meeting highlighting ideas. The Youth Cabinet's involvement and engagement around the political arena was

welcomed and some consideration needed to be given as to how this could be facilitated.

Councillor Beaumont, Cabinet Member for Children and Education Services, and Councillor J. Hamilton, Chairman of the Improving Lives Select Commission, were also in attendance at the manifesto launch and expressed their support to the Youth Cabinet.

49. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 19th September, 2014 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

50. WORK IN PROGRESS

Self Regulation Select Commission:-

Councillor Currie, Chairman, confirmed the commencement of the review into Standing Orders, which was being chaired by Councillor Watson.

The budget and capital monitoring would be considered at the next scheduled meeting on the 23rd October, 2014 and it was suggested that the Commission also give consideration to the costs associated with out of authority placements with an invitation being extended to the members of the Improving Lives Select Commission.

The budget setting process would also feature as part of the Commission's work programme in the next few months.

Councillor Watson, Vice-Chairman, confirmed that the first meeting of the review into Standing Orders had now taken place and completed before the Council Meeting in December.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

Councillor Read, Chairman, confirmed that the Commission held its last meeting on the 15th October, 2014 where it considered the local economy review, looking specifically at the governance, funding and outcomes for the Combined Authority, Local Enterprise Partnership and the City Region to ensure Rotherham received its share of benefits and participated fully.

The second item on that agenda had been grass cutting/grass maintenance and officers provided feedback from the grass maintenance review, on how improvements could be made to grass cutting and how problems could be avoided.

The Commission would also welcomed any support via other Commissions about the town centre and safety.

Councillor Sims, Vice-Chairman, confirmed an update had been received as part of the condensation and damp scrutiny review with a further meeting scheduled for 23rd October, 2014.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

Councillor J. Hamilton, Chairman, confirmed the next meeting of the Commission as being 5th November, 2014, where consideration would be given to the Annual Adult Safeguarding Board and an update on the domestic violence review and forced marriages.

Health Select Commission:-

Councillor Steele, Chairman, had nothing further to add for Health.

The Board noted the outcome of the recent meeting between the Acting Chairman and the Leader of the Council regarding new arrangements for the presentation and receipt of scrutiny reviews at the Cabinet, with a view to this being in operation from January, 2015.

Resolved:- That the information shared be noted.

51. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

52. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place on Friday, 14th November, 2014 at 9.00 a.m.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
14th November, 2014

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Currie, J. Hamilton, Middleton, Parker, Read, Sansome, Sims, Vines, Watson and Wyatt.

53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Wyatt declared a disclosable interest in Minute No. 57 (Scrutiny Review – Access to G.P.'s) on the grounds of his wife's employment and left the meeting whilst this item was discussed.

Councillor Currie declared a personal interest in Minute No. 56 (Licensing Policy) on the grounds that he was involved with M.O.T. testing on vehicles.

54. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

55. NOMINATIONS TO COMMITTEES AND PANELS

56. HACKNEY CARRIAGE AND PRIVATE HIRE LICENSING POLICY - CONSULTATION

Further to Minute No. 17 of the meeting of the Licensing Board held on 27th October, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Dave Richmond, Director of Housing and Neighbours, and Alan Pogorzelec, Regulatory Manager, which since the publication of the Jay report had had a significant impact on public confidence in Rotherham's taxi and private hire industry. This report outlined how the Council could improve and strengthen its regulation of the industry to ensure that the standards applied in Rotherham were amongst the most stringent operating anywhere in the country. This approach was intended to ensure that using taxis in Rotherham was a safe, reliable, and pleasant experience, providing reassurance for local people, and as a result Rotherham has a high quality, sustainable taxi trade.

There would be extensive public consultation about the new licensing policy for hackney carriages and private hire vehicles, their operators and drivers. The period of consultation began on Monday 3rd November, 2014 and would last for eight weeks until 28th December, 2014. This had been widely published in the local press, radio stations and on the social media feeds.

Details of the requirements in relation to applications for a licence to drive a hackney carriage or private hire vehicle and checks currently undertaken and the amendments to the process were circulated and referred to in detail.

It was noted that the new licensing policy would incorporate the proposed changes to the checks for suitability of people that applied for a hackney carriage or private hire driver's licence. This would ensure that the Council only issued a licence to those persons that were considered "fit and proper" to hold a licence.

The Board sought clarification on the definition of a good character and how to define a "fit and proper" person, details on the knowledge test and pass mark and whether or not this incorporated a language test. They were informed about who could submit a reference for good character, the pass mark (not rate) required for the knowledge test and how there were no plans to include a standard language test at this stage. In terms of the determination if an applicant was being truthful or misleading or not, this was for the Licensing Board to balance out in their deliberations as to the consideration of them being "fit and proper" and whether they should be provided with a licence.

Whilst the Board were reassured by the answers above, it was pointed out that it was hoped those applying for a licence had the basic requirements for literacy and numeracy and the ability to communicate verbally when driving a taxi and it was suggested that this be considered further.

The new policy, in line with the requirements of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act, the Council did not discriminate against those that have previously been convicted of a criminal offence, but one of the key purposes of licensing was to protect the public from those that may present a risk to their safety. In view of this the Council had developed a series of guidelines that provided assistance when determining applications, which had been revised and which were significantly more stringent in relation to the standards that were applied.

The Board were reassured that the table in the policy only gave a synopsis of the type of offences, when full details were provided in the appendices. A copy of this information should be provided for Board Members.

The proposals also introduced a number of standards that it expected licensed drivers to abide by which related to dress code, transportation of unaccompanied children and conduct when working with vulnerable passengers and the requirement to hand in a licence if a driver was not working for an extended period of time.

The Board sought clarification whether this included the contracts for transporting school children, how it was intended for the extended leave to be monitored and were informed that this policy did not include school contracts at this stage and the monitoring process depended on the applicants telling the truth.

The Board also asked about arrangements for the transporting of children, the legal requirement for car seats and the dress code to ensure the drivers' identities were not obscured.

The Board were informed that in terms of car and booster seats for children, this was difficult to address and the onus was on the person booking the taxi to provide one. However, the point was well made and would be looked into further.

The Board were also mindful of the period of licence options available to the Licensing Board to grant, but suggested that consideration be given to any new driver only be issued a licence for an initial twelve months.

The policy also included proposals in relation to vehicles that it licensed around the issuing of Certificates of Compliance, vehicle age, signage, tyres, meters, C.C.T.V. and advertising.

The Board asked questions about the issuing of a Certificate of Compliance rather than a M.O.T. and were informed that the standards used were similar to an M.O.T. It was also pointed out that any vehicle licensed as a taxi remained a licensed vehicle and could not be driven by unlicensed drivers. It was highly unlikely that the same vehicle would be registered for use by two different operators as there was a requirement for fixed licensed plate signage.

The Board were also reassured about the policy requirements for the use of a licensing vehicle on the occasions when the meter and C.C.T.V. were not in operation.

In general the Board were satisfied that the proposals being put forward addressed many of the areas of concern previously raised and asked that this be included on the Forward Plan of Key Decisions as it affected more than one ward in the Borough.

Resolved:- (1) That the draft Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy and its contents be noted as part of the public consultation.

(2) That a review of the Licensing Policy be carried out in twelve months time following introduction in April, 2015.

(3) That further consideration be given to the provision of car and booster seat provision in licensed vehicles.

(4) That links to the policy be provided for all Members of this Board.

(5) That further consideration be given to alternative tests for all new applicants on verbal communication.

57. SCRUTINY REVIEW - ACCESS TO G.P.S

Further to Minute No. 86 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 5th November, 2014, consideration was given to a report presented by Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, which set out the response of NHS England (NHS E) the GP Service Commissioner and Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to the scrutiny review of access to GP's.

The majority of the Review Group's recommendations were to health partners rather than the Council, but a collective response them all was co-ordinated by the Lead Officer.

The responses to the recommendations, due back to the Cabinet in July, were quite specific in nature, but some remained unanswered directly by N.H.S. England.

In general N.H.S. England appeared to be in agreement with the sentiments expressed in the recommendations, but overall there was a lack of detail or confusion in the responses submitted. It was suggested that they be invited to a future meeting to discuss their responses.

The Chairman of the Review Group, Councillor Hoddinott, expressed disappointment with the responses received, the length of time it had taken to receive the responses and the confusion around Recommendations 5 and 6.

The recommendations that were key to the whole review were Recommendations 3 and 10 which focused on the sit and wait slots for appointments, peaks in the walk in centre and the management of demand. The essence of these recommendations were missed or were not fully addressed in the responses.

The reasoning and evidence of good practice behind the sit and wait slots were outlined further and examples of where good practice existed were identified. It was acknowledged that these kind of surgery operations eradicated the concerns about appointments being made and subsequently missed when some patients did not turn up.

The Board acknowledged the amount of work that had gone into this review and expressed their dissatisfaction with some of the responses. It was suggested that N.H.S. England be asked to attend a meeting of the Health Select Commission to give reasons as why some of the recommendations were responded to as they were. On this basis it was suggested that, as the work programme had already been set, that an extraordinary meeting be convened and invitations be extended to N.H.S. England and the Clinical Commissioning Group with the concerns of this Board and Cabinet clearly outlined.

The Board also noted the development of a joint protocol which would ensure that the local Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB), Health Select Commission (HSC) and Healthwatch Rotherham develop a constructive and productive working relationship with one another. Each body had an independent role and a shared aim to reduce health inequalities and improve health and wellbeing outcomes. The roles were distinctive, but complementary, and must add value to each other's work, and avoid duplication and a copy of the joint protocol would be made available for all Members of this Board.

Resolved:- (1) That the report the concerns expressed by the Cabinet be noted.

(2) That an extraordinary meeting of the Health Select Commission be convened in January, 2015, with invitations extended to both NHS England and the CCG regarding the recommendations in the report.

(3) That the response be resubmitted back to the Cabinet in due course.

(4) That a copy of the joint protocol be provided for all Members of this Board for information.

58. CHILDREN'S COMMISSIONER'S TAKE-OVER DAY

Caroline Webb, Senior Scrutiny and Member Development Officer, confirmed that at the next meeting of the Youth Cabinet, scheduled for 20th November, 2014, consideration was to be given to an update on the review of self harm, which was supported by Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board. Invitations to this meeting were extended to Board Members.

In addition, the Youth Cabinet were also wishing to look at the issues of extending votes to sixteen year olds and how parliamentary candidates made their work youth friendly and addresses the issues of young people.

This would form the basis of the Take-Over Day and the precise details were yet to be confirmed, but would possible take place during February, 2015 half term when prospective parliamentary candidates may be available to answer questions.

Resolved:- That the information on the Take-Over Day be noted.

59. CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION - SCRUTINY OF THE REPORT BY PROFESSOR ALEXIS JAY

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, provided information on the draft proposals for the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board to scrutinise the report of Professor Alexis Jay and sought agreement on how to take these forward.

It was suggested that a wider piece of work be undertaken on the Jay Report over a two day period, with the first taking place on the scheduled Board meeting of Friday, 12th December, followed by a further date of Thursday, 18th December, 2014.

The two full day sessions would look specifically at the implications for Local Government and the experiences elsewhere and how Rotherham could learn from good practice. This would also include looking at the implications for the criminal justice agencies and the effectiveness of support that was available for victims of child sexual exploitation.

This would also seek to build on the work undertaken by the Improving Lives Select Commission twelve months ago to bring together the partners' contributions to the child sexual exploitation action plan.

Initial discussions have taken place with Professor Alexis Jay who was willing to attend one of the sessions to look at the implications of her report on Rotherham.

The two days would be carefully structured and managed and all Members would be invited to attend. There would be the opportunities for public questions with time constraints, but it would be a requirement that these questions were submitted in advance of the meetings.

In terms of questions from other Elected Members it was suggested that the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board write out to all Members inviting them to submit questions in order to assist with planning for the two day sessions. Questions would then be aligned to the most appropriate session and assessed to avoid any duplication. Spontaneous questioning would be reserved for Overview and Scrutiny Management Board Members only.

To assist with preparing for the two days sessions in December it was also proposed that two sources of external support be provided:-

- 25th November, 2014 – member development session on questioning skills. Invitations would be made to Overview and Scrutiny Management Board Members initially with the intention of using a case study in that session around the scrutiny of child sexual exploitation.
- Ed Hammond from the Centre for Public Scrutiny would be available to provide individual advice and support for effective scrutiny.

The Board welcomed the opportunity to scrutinise the Jay Report, but were advised that in order to manage the scrutiny process effectively over the two day period it was necessary to ask other Members to submit their questions in advance of the meeting. This had been carefully considered by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman in consultation with the Monitoring Officer. Whilst some additional questions may be triggered by the

responses to other questions, it was suggested that these should only feed in via Overview and Scrutiny Members. The suggestion that this should be in a question/answer seminar format was felt to be inappropriate as this matter needed to be scrutinised and managed effectively.

Further questions were raised about whether or not extra questions could be considered if the times allocated were flexible and how strictly this would be enforced. The Board were informed that once Professor Jay had confirmed her attendance professional witnesses would be invited at specific times during the two days and would require the whole two day process to be tightly managed.

Specific details on the question and answer sessions were to be confirmed in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and any additional questioning would be allowed at the Chairman's discretion if there were time allowed.

Resolved:- That the arrangements for the two day sessions to consider the scrutiny of the report by Professor Alexis Jay be approved.

60. PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, referred to the Forward Plan of Key Decisions, which had been circulated as part of the agenda pack.

The Board expressed their disappointment in the contents of the document as it was sparsely populated with information.

It was suggested that this issue be raised as an agenda item for consideration at the next Cabinet/Strategic Leadership Team/Scrutiny Meeting as a matter of some urgency.

Resolved:- That the Forward Plan of Key Decisions be included as an agenda item for discussion at the next meeting of Cabinet/Strategic Leadership Team/Scrutiny.

61. ISSUES REFERRED FROM THE AREA ASSEMBLIES

There were none.

62. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

All matters were covered as part of the Eleven Million Take Over Day as part of this meeting.

63. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 17TH OCTOBER, 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 17th October, 2014 be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

64. WORK IN PROGRESS

Improving Places Select Commission:-

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, confirmed that discussion had taken place around the work programme and how the implications of the Jay Report could be incorporated, which would also link into future consideration of town centre safety for young people.

Future agenda items would also include:-

- Conclusion of the Council housing report.
- Investment Plan and key areas of activity.
- City Region.
- Community Infrastructure Levy.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

Councillor J. Hamilton, Chairman, confirmed that at the last meeting consideration had been given to the Annual Adult Safeguarding Board and an update on the domestic violence review and presentation on forced marriages.

Health Select Commission:-

Councillor Sansome, Vice-Chairman, referred to the work on the Scrutiny Review of Incontinence, the joint meeting relating to the specialist cardiac unit in Leeds and also the response to the dental and orthodontic services.

Self Regulation Select Commission:-

Councillor Currie, Chairman, confirmed the Commission would continue in its role of monitoring the revenue and budget monitoring process, the budget setting process, including the budget consultations as part of the Commission's work programme in the next few months.

Resolved:- That the information shared be noted.

65. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

66. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board take place on Friday, 12th December, 2014 at 9.00 a.m.

**IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
15th October, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Read (in the Chair); Councillors Cowles, Gilding, Roche and Sims, together with co-opted members Mrs. L. Shears and Mr. B. Walker.

Also in attendance:- Councillor Jepson and Mr. D. Pickering.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Foden) and from Councillors Andrews, Atkin, Gosling and Whelbourn and from co-opted members Mrs. P. Copnell and Mr. P. Cahill.

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest made at this meeting.

28. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

29. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items to report.

30. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 16TH SEPTEMBER 2014

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 16th September, 2014, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

31. SHEFFIELD CITY REGION

The Select Commission received a presentation from the Director of Planning, Regeneration and Culture and the Economic Development Manager entitled "Sheffield City Region Local Enterprise Partnership Combined Authority", providing an overview of the Local Enterprise Partnership. The presentation and Members' discussion highlighted the following issues:-

- this subject had been identified, during the scrutiny review of support for Rotherham's local economy, as a matter about which Members required further information;

- a structure diagram was provided of the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority;

- the principal strands of housing/residential, infrastructure, HS2, skills for growth and partnership and business growth;

- the complicated nature of the arrangements and the need for clear lines of accountability;
- the Sheffield City Region – a “functional economic area” (accommodating 1.8 million people; supporting 700,000 jobs);
- start-up rates of new businesses, productivity, private sector employment – all are below national averages, although there have been improvements in recent years;
- it is acknowledged that there ought to be improvement in the economic performance of the Sheffield City Region;
- history and development of the Local Economic Partnership and of the Combined Authority (the latter being formally established on 1st April 2014);
- the Combined Authority’s remit for transport arrangements, including the management of the region’s 10-years allocation of major transport scheme funding; the allocation of funding for transport from the ‘Growth Fund’;
- the Combined Authority’s remit for economic development, providing accountability and ‘holding’ the public money (including Growth Fund allocations); the Local Economic Partnership leads on strategy and delivery;
- the Combined Authority’s remit for Planning – the duty to co-operate; aligning the work of the Local Plans (the district councils retain the role and function as the Local Planning Authorities); details of the Strategic Economic Plan; economic and demographic forecasting to aid future integrated infrastructure across the City Region;
- the staffing structure of the Combined Authority/Local Economic Partnership and its total, annual operational costs (Members asked to be provided with these details);
- comparison with previous regimes (eg: Yorkshire Forward; English Partnerships; the Dearne Valley project; etc);
- the availability of brownfield sites, across the region, for future industrial development;
- the Local Enterprise Partnership is still in its infancy, therefore any judgement of its value and effectiveness may be premature; some benefits have already accrued (eg; the Growth Fund, with local businesses able to access grants; establishment of the new Enterprise Zones);

- the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) – a strategic body established to drive forward economic growth (the LEP comprises Council Members and private sector representatives from across the Region, with a private sector representative taking the chair); operation of the Inward Investment Team, which attracts new businesses to the Region;
- the Strategic Economic Plan – to transform the local economy during the next decade; used to bid for central Government funding from the Growth Deal;
- the LEP Growth Deal – supporting infrastructure projects; skills bank; training for people; business investment and support programme; the establishment of the British Glass Academy; Members asked to be informed of the chosen location of the Academy building;
- European Structural and Investment Funds Strategy (ESIF) – total value of more than £177 millions for the Sheffield City Region – used to deliver the Strategic Economic Plan; money provided from the European Union (eg: the European Social Fund); joint working with external organisations (eg: Department for Work and Pensions);
- details were provided of the Sheffield City Region ESIF Committee;
- Skills and Employment – three strands to the “Skills Growth Deal”; the Skills Bank (funding for training); Progress to Work (people aged 24 years and over); other projects such as: “Learn to Work (schools/careers); “Skills Made Easy” (apprenticeships);
- ways of identifying the skills gap (employer-led by the private sector);
- local Chambers of Commerce help with promotion of “Skills Growth Deal” projects;
- the nine priority sectors of the Local Economic Partnership (ie: Advanced Manufacturing and Materials, Business and Professional Services, Creative and Digital Industries, Healthcare Technologies, Logistics, Low Carbon, Property and Construction, Retail, Sport Leisure and Tourism);
- the Regional Growth Fund – provided by the coalition Government to aid the expansion of business and creation of new jobs;
- Enterprise Zones (at Waverley; also near to M1 motorway junctions 36 (Barnsley) and 29 (Chesterfield); impact of the proposed HS 2 rail route upon Waverley and the possible relocation of that Enterprise Zone to Dinnington); business rates are to be held centrally by the Combined Authority (and the LEP); Members requested details of the site locations and boundaries of the Enterprise Zones;
- payment of the Living Wage and possible impact upon the City Region;

- the current strategic aims of the Sheffield City Region are transport and economic growth (although it was noted that such aims may occasionally be subject to change).

Copies of the presentation slides are to be provided for all Members of this Select Commission.

It was noted that a seminar for all Members of the Council, about the operation of the Sheffield City Region, is to be held on Tuesday 25th November, 2014 and representatives of the Sheffield City Region will be invited to attend.

After thanking officers for the informative presentation, the Select Commission agreed that:-

- a) the presentation was the starting point to developing a greater understanding of the implications of the Sheffield City Region structures; however, at this stage, it had raised more questions than provided answers;
- b) the Scrutiny Manager shall provide a briefing note for a future meeting of this Select Commission, about the implications for the work programme of consideration of this matter;
- c) further information shall be sought about the resources being committed by this Council and its partner organisations to the Sheffield City Region structures.

32. GROUNDS MAINTENANCE - SCRUTINY REVIEW - UPDATE

Further to Minute No. 36 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 27th November, 2013 and Minute No. 25 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 16th September, 2014, consideration was given to a report, presented by the Director of Streetpride, concerning progress with the implementation of the action plan arising from the scrutiny review of this Council's Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services. A copy of the updated action plan was included with the submitted report.

The report also included an explanation of the difficulties experienced with grass cutting, across the Borough area during the Summer of 2014. An important aspect had been the 'perfect' grass growing conditions created by the mild Winter during late 2013 and early 2014.

The Select Commission's discussion highlighted the following issues:-

: the type of grass cutting machinery being used (the detailed contractual arrangements were noted);

: complaints received by the Council about various quality issues, such as the frequency of cutting, non-removal of grass clippings; reference was made to the examples of specific sites about which complaints were being made by members of the public;

: requests from the public for grass cutting to happen more frequently;

: the 28 sites, located in various areas across the Borough, upon which there was only limited grass cutting, leaving longer grass and sometimes having a pathway cut through the grass (this arrangement enabled cost savings to be made);

: reduced grass cutting frequency as a budget/cost reduction exercise (it was noted that the arrangement of five cuts per year was acknowledged to be the minimum amount);

: Housing Revenue Account funding for sites which are Council-owned and funded from that account; there has been improved frequency of grass cutting at these sites (ie: intervals of two weeks, whilst other Borough Council-owned sites have been cut at intervals of four weeks); details were provided of the arrangements and funding for the grounds maintenance of HRA sites during the Winter 2014/2015 and later in the year 2015, involving specific selected sites across the Borough;

: the impact of very wet weather upon grass cutting; the hindrance also caused to grass cutting by the construction of fencing in and around sites;

: the intention to commence grass cutting during March 2015 (depending upon weather conditions), in accordance with the agreed budget;

: 'gateway' sites to the Rotherham town centre and also to other towns and villages around the Borough area, where it is important for grounds maintenance to be undertaken regularly in order to enhance the attractive appearance of these areas;

: the quality of cutting is usually dependent upon the type of mower used (eg: flail, rotary and cylinder mowers); the different types of machinery are used on all sites, although at different times of the cutting season, to try and maintain a consistent standard of grass cutting across all sites;

: the arrangements of the Council's grass cutting teams of operatives, who will utilise the various types of grass cutting equipment and machinery;

: the impact of budget reductions on grass cutting frequencies; the use of temporary employees during the cutting season which increases the flexibility of the grass cutting arrangements;

: whether the responsibility for the grounds maintenance of very small areas of open space (usually situated in residential areas) remains with the householders or becomes adopted and is therefore maintainable at public expense; it was noted that these areas are often included within newly-constructed residential developments;

: the practice of 'grubbing out' to ensure the removal of weeds; an additional street sweeper will be utilised to try and ensure a good standard of weed removal;

: the recording of contacts from the public, so that the Streetpride teams of operatives will be sent to the areas of highest demand; it was explained that Streetpride already undertakes the monitoring of calls and contacts and whilst it is important to adhere to the maintenance schedules, there is an element of flexibility to move the teams of operatives to the worst areas (this practice is also used in respect of street sweeping);

: the continuing use of volunteers and Streetpride champions; the loan of equipment to community groups undertaking litter-picking; it was noted that budget reductions had resulted in the disestablishment of staff positions who would promote community litter-picking around the Borough area and in schools;

: the volunteer scheme "Love My Streets" is still being developed and certificates issued to volunteers who assist with street cleansing and grounds maintenance.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the Action Plan for the scrutiny review of this Council's Grounds Maintenance and Street Cleansing services be updated, as a consequence of today's discussion, in order that it may be signed off as completed.

**APPOINTMENTS PANEL
9th October, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Hoddinott, Middleton, Steele and C. Vines.

**APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN
AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES**

Consideration was given to an application for employment for the post of Interim Strategic Director of Children's Services.

Following a thorough process of consideration of work experience and questions by Panel Members including contributions by the Leader of the Opposition, it was unanimously agreed that Mr. Ian Thomas be offered the appointment subject to satisfying the normal employment checks.

Resolved:- That Mr. Ian Thomas be appointed Interim Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
15th October, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Roche (in the Chair); Councillors Currie, Ellis, J. Hamilton, Havenhand, Kaye, Read, Reeder, Sharman and Swift.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ahmed, Beaumont, Clark, Godfrey, Jepson and Pitchley.

SCHOOL STANDARDS AND EXAM RESULTS.

Councillor D. Roche, Adviser, Children and Education Services, opened the seminar and thanked all for attending. He introduced Karen Borthwick, Head of the School Effectiveness Service (Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services Directorate). Karen had prepared a presentation to appraise Elected Members on the current picture of school standards in Rotherham.

Attendees were asked to state whether ten statements provided were true or false. The statements were used as discussion points to separate commonly-held myths from the reality in Rotherham: - .

1. The Local Authority was responsible for all children across the Borough to be making progress in all schools. This role was facilitated by the School Effectiveness Service, who worked with maintained schools, academies and other partners, including dioceses, private schools, safeguarding, the admissions authority, parents' views/engagement and governors to work together for improved outcomes for children.

There was an Ofsted inspection framework (currently withdrawn) for local authorities' school improvement functions. Regional neighbours had been subject to school improvement inspections.

There was good engagement with all schools and academies in Rotherham. This was very positive and should be something that the Local Authority was very proud of.

2. Rotherham's Early Years Foundation Stage profile was above the national average in 2013 and 2014. This was a strong performance and Ofsted outcomes for early years settings were positive across all providers – schools, voluntary settings and private providers. The School Effectiveness Service constantly worked to build up good working relationships with all providers.

Q: Councillor Kaye asked what impact the Imagination Library had had on improved Early Years Foundation Stage outcomes? The scheme had been running for a significant period of time and children on the scheme had now started school.

- A: Improvements had been seen across the board in the Early Years and Foundation Stage and the relationship between one intervention (e.g. the Imagination Library) and overall outcomes was really hard to separate. It was clear that the Imagination Library would have had an impact / contribution to overall outcomes.
- Q: Councillor Hamilton asked what impact was expected following changes to the designation of some of the Borough's Children's Centres?
- A: No Children's Centres were closing but there would be changes to their designations and there was always a risk associated with change. If Elected Members wanted more information about this the Head of the Early Years and Foundation Stage could provide additional information.
- Q: Councillor Currie spoke about the emerging focus on Early Years over the past years. Was the Learning Community model helping primary schools to improve their outcomes?
- A: Yes. The re-focusing of Children's Centres to a learning and education drive had been important. Rotherham was moving to having a Foundation Years' Service as the importance of care, quality of learning and engagement with families was recognised as important for improved experiences for children, young people and their families and for improved outcomes.
- Q: Councillor Swift spoke about how the demographic changes to Rotherham's population had brought about changes, and improvements, to outcomes. Where new housing was built, this often had a positive impact on local attainment rates.
- A: Rotherham's mobile population brought positive and negative consequences for education outcomes across the Borough. Where the nature of catchment areas changed it could lead to a change in the skills and focus that professionals working in the area needed.
3. Rotherham's performance was above the national average in Key Stage 4 in 2014, which was significantly above neighbours. Children started school in Rotherham well below the national average but left school at 16 performing well above the national average. Rotherham's performance at Key Stage Four had decreased by 3.6%, but due to changes in reporting of KS4 results in 2014 performance could not be compared to previous years'.
4. Almost 80% of children attended a Rotherham school that was judged to be Good or better. The national average was 76% as at 1st April, 2014. The aim of the Local Authority was that all children would attend a Good or better school. Where schools were below the

standard of Good, the School Effectiveness Service was working with them and / or challenging them to improve.

5. In Rotherham 87% of children in secondary school were attending a school that had been rated as Good or better. Nationally the picture was 72%, as at 1st April, 2014. Rotherham was above the national average at secondary.
6. In Rotherham performance at English GCSE A*-C had been above the national average for the last three years. Progress had been 5.1% above the National average in 2013.
7. In Rotherham the average at Key Stage Two Mathematics was above the national averages. This included being above the national average at L4+ and L4B+ and was in-line with the national average at L5+ for the first time.
8. Rotherham's % young people who were 'NEET' (Not in employment, education or training) had declined 2.2% between 2006 and 2013 at a time of economic decline.
9. In Rotherham, of the 1,047 children who were eligible to achieve pupil premium funding, 385 did not achieve L4+ in reading, writing and mathematics in 2014. The % of pupils eligible for pupil premium funding who achieved L4+ in reading, writing and maths had increased by 4% in 2014.
10. The number of schools in Rotherham who were below the Department for Education's Floor Standard had reduced to 3 in 2014. There had been 8 in 2013.

Karen referred to the document entitled 'Education Outcomes in Rotherham Schools and Settings'. This document had been produced by the School Effectiveness Service and was available for all stakeholders to give relevant information about Rotherham's outcomes. The document would be updated yearly and would describe the national stages and expectations from the Early Years Foundation Stage up to Key Stage 4.

Discussion continued and the following issues were raised: -

Q: - Councillor Currie asked about teacher assessment between the stages of Key Stages 1 and 2. He was pleased that it was now peer and professionally moderated. This should be a key question that Governors asked: - 'are the assessments a true picture of our children?'

A: - Good quality assessment was crucial and schools, the Local Authority and stakeholders needed to choose the right data and act on it correctly. It was key to look at whether the children were progressing and whether there were aspirations for progression.

Q: - Councillor Kaye referred to the various types of testing used across the Borough at primary school level. This made it difficult for secondary schools to work with their Year 7 pupils who all had different levels of progress. However, the majority of Sheffield's schools followed the same system, which was available to be bought into, allowing consistency over the whole area.

A: - National Government was making changes to the system. The worry that schools may start to conduct their own assessments was a projection – Year 6 SATs tests were consistent across the nation. Proposed changes were to assess without assigning levels. One of the strengths of working within learning communities meant that schools were co-operating for increased consistency. The Local Authority could not tell schools what to do, schools had the autonomy to arrange themselves.

The Rotherham School Effectiveness Service provided training on the Sheffield model and other models of assessment.

Current areas of focus and continuing discussion: -

Phonics – the sharing of good practice was taking place. Head teachers who would act as phonics champions had been identified and the very best schools were supporting less strong schools.

Q: - Councillor Ellis asked how the reason/s for the dip in performance were being identified and addressed? Was the dip across all schools or schools with certain demographics?

A: - The School Effectiveness Service was doing research work with schools with high levels of children who spoke English as an additional language.

KS2 – Although it was increasing across the board in all subjects there was still a need to close the gap to national average.

KS4 – outcomes were considered as at August, 2014, which represented un-validated data. New methods of comparing data had been introduced, including not considered the results of pupils who had been entered early for exams. Although the overall picture of attainment had reduced, it did not necessarily mean that there were children leaving school with less qualifications.

Q: - Councillor Roche asked about the performance of pupils who were eligible for Pupil Premium compared to their more advantaged peers.

A: - Verified data would be available in the new year.

Councillor Roche thanked Karen for her presentation and contribution to the discussion which was useful for all Elected Members in attendance.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That the presentation slides and supporting documents be circulated to all Elected Members for their information with the health warning that the data in relation to 2014 outcomes had not yet undergone validation.

APPOINTMENTS PANEL
29th October, 2014

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Hoddinott and Read.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That the following item be considered in the absence of the press and the public as being exempt under Paragraph 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act, 1972 (staffing matters).

SHORT TERM COVER ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR OF CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES

Consideration was given to a report presented by Jacqueline Collins, Director of Legal and Democratic Services, which sought approval with regard to the short term arrangement for the appointment of a temporary Strategic Director of Children and Young People, prior to an Interim Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services being appointed given that there would remain a period of time until January, 2015 without a nominated officer for this statutory post.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, should the Panel approve this arrangement, Cabinet would need to be consulted prior to the appointment being confirmed.

Resolved:- That the temporary appointment of the current Director of Safeguarding, Children and Families to the post of Strategic Director, Children and Young People and be designated the statutory post holder of Director of Children's Services be approved.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
11th November, 2014**

Present:- Councillor Currie (in the Chair); Councillors Cutts, J. Hamilton, N. Hamilton, Pitchley, Reeder, Sansome, Sharman, Steele, Turner, Watson and Wyatt.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Buckley, Clark, Cowles, Dalton, Jepson, McNeely and Read.

COUNCILLOR SURGERIES AND E-CASEWORK.

Councillor S. Currie, Chairperson of the Self-Regulation Select Commission, opened the Seminar and thanked attendees for their attendance. Stuart Purcell (Performance and Quality Officer) and Jean Tracey (HR Consultant) had been invited to the Seminar to provide an update on the issues around Councillor surgeries and e-casework that the Self-Regulation Select Commission regularly considered regarding customer contacts and complaints and the resolution of issues that were raised, including via council surgeries.

Stuart explained the joint responsibility of the Performance and Quality Team and the Human Resources Learning and Development Team around the issues raised at Councillor surgeries and the use of the e-casework system.

The e-casework system had been used for around 5 years. The system was interactive and emailed the Councillor who had opened a case every time anything happened towards resolving the issue.

During 2013/2014, 714 cases had been raised on e-casework (this had increased from 572 raised during 2012/2013). The true picture of issues raised via Councillor surgeries was likely to be a lot higher; the 714 cases were the ones that were recorded and could be audited. Each year a 30% increase in e-casework cases was expected.

The 714 cases input into e-casework fell into the following Directorates: -

- Economic Development Services – 361: -
 - Network Management - 87;
 - Leisure and Community Services - 95;
 - Highway Design and Transportation Service - 32.

- Housing and Neighbourhood Services – 324: -
 - Contract & Service Development – 122;
 - Housing & Communities – 100;
 - Housing Options – 58;
 - Safer Neighbourhoods - 28.

- Adult Social Services - 16;
- Former Resources – 8;
- Children's and Young Peoples Services - 5.

The process of what happens when an e-casework was input by a Councillor was outlined. The Performance and Quality Team received the issue and ensured that it was sent on to the correct service/officer for a response to be sent back within ten working days to either the Councillor or directly to the member of the public.

Discussion followed on the initial information presented: -

Q: - Currie: - Entering into e-casework could be done by the Secretariat team if Councillors were unable to do this themselves.

Q: - Wyatt: - I have-used e-casework a lot and like the updates it provides. The low numbers for Resources are surprising – I have entered a number about Council Tax and Housing Benefits issues and would have assumed that other Councillors would have too. It is annoying when a case is closed down but I have not had a resolution. Who closed it down without my say so?

Q: - Watson: - There needs to be a response to the customer and an email to the Councillor informing them of the outcome/s.

A: - S. Purcell: - Currently different Directorates were taking different approaches. This was being worked through. Eventually, all Services will respond directly to customers. In the interim, responses to Councillors will make it clear to Councillors that no response has gone to the member of the public and that they are required to pass the response on.

Q: - Watson: - Cases are being closed and they should not be until we say so. Where this has happened and the customer is not satisfied it has been necessary to start again from scratch.

Q: - N Hamilton: - I am surprised by the low numbers as I use it all of the time. I am also surprised on the numbers sent to each Directorate, some seem too low. Are automatic responses used? Do passwords time out if e-casework is not used regularly?

A: - J. Tracey: - Yes, to ensure good security, passwords will need to be periodically updated.

Q: - J. Hamilton: - Who decides where casework issues should be treated as a complaint?

A: - S. Purcell: - If they are specifically badged up as a complaint we would deal with it that way. Otherwise, it would get dealt with as a casework issue.

Q: - Currie: - I want e-casework to filter out the complaints and for them to be treated as such. The addition of a tick box for Councillors to signify a complaint would enable this.

Q: - J. Hamilton – Outlined a Ward-specific issue that was reported via e-casework and did not seem to progress. It should have been treated as a complaint.

A: - S. Purcell: - Even if no action appeared to be taken you should have still received a response within 10 working days to show that the expression of dissatisfaction had been noted.

Q: - Watson: - In some cases if an issue is dealt with as a casework matter and the constituent remains unhappy they have to go through the process again from scratch to start a complaint.

Q: - Steele: – There should be a consistent approach with Officers giving responses across the whole organisation. How do you ensure that there is not one person making the same contact/complaint repeatedly through a variety of methods?

A: - S. Purcell: - We log and track all contacts and we would notice if the same issue kept on reappearing. The same issue would also be forwarded on to the same Officer for a response, so they would be aware and prevent any duplication. Even if a customer raised multiple issues, they would receive one response.

Jean Tracey spoke through the process of logging an issue via the e-casework homepage using the options displayed on the grey tabs. It was possible to add constituents' details onto the system so you did not have to re-add their address details.

Only Councillors could close cases when they were satisfied, and a small number of administrators who would only close the case when told to by the Councillor who opened it. The issues of cases being closed without Councillors' knowledge of the outcome or say so would be addressed.

Q: - Reeder – What is the box 'siebel job id' for?

A: - J. Tracey: - That is a reference to the old system, we will remove it.

The box stating 'Assigned to' gave 5 Directorates to select based on the issues. It defaulted to the top option 'CYPS'. The CYPS statistics had seen an increase due to Councillors not choosing the appropriate Directorate and using the default option of CYPS.

Stuart Purcell oversaw the issues coming in and ensured that all notifications of issues reported by Councillors were acted on swiftly.

Councillors should use the 'Actions' box to write about what the incident/issue involved.

Use the email address Support@e-casework.org for suggestions and feedback about the e-casework system. This email address was maintained by the external company that operated the e-casework system. They responded quickly and were happy to accept feedback and ideas.

The November 2013 – November 2014 e-casework closure statistics were considered: -

- Cases complete in 0-5 days - 61;
- Cases complete in 6-10 days - 25;
- Cases complete in 11-15 days – 43;
- Cases complete in 15+ days - 508.

Cases going beyond 11+ days were due to Councillors not closing cases promptly.

Q: - Steele: - Councillors are not always the reason, we need to be made aware when cases were going to take longer.

Q: - Reeder: – Boxes that are not used are confusing.

A: - J. Tracey: - E-casework are going to develop the system further and will remove the boxes that are out of date.

A: - S. Purcell: - My team does not have the access to close-down. Only people who can close are those who opened it. We add information to the system, but cannot close anything.

Q: - N. Hamilton – I have never closed one myself but I have lots closed on my account.

A: - Currie – An email prompt to close would be useful.

Q: - Watson: - Is the data referring to first response times? I have experienced complex cases that need to go beyond 10 working days.

A: - S. Purcell: - 90% of cases opened were closed within 10 working days. The graph relates to when they are physically put on the system.

Q: - Currie – A simple guide on e-casework and training sessions would be useful.

A: - J. Tracey: - It would be possible to change the dates for urgent cases.

S. Purcell: - An increase in use by this time next year is expected. The aspiration would be for all Councillors to use the system as e-casework enables recording all in one place, creation of reference numbers and enables auditing. A keyword search facility is available. The system is simple to use and fast.

Support and training contact details were shared.

Q: - Currie – The system allows audit and good governance. When I use it I get responses that constituents are happy and feel they are being listened to.

Q: - Turner – I have always worked outside of the scheme as it takes away individuals and identification; I like to know who I am talking to. The system does not give immediate human feedback. I like to know who is doing the work so that I can thank the Officers involved.

A: - Currie – saying thank you to the responsible Officer is good. However, an audit of the system would suggest that you had not reported or had not held any Councillor surgeries.

Q: - Reeder – I do thank the responsible Officer, there is a way on e-casework. I use my laptop, rather than an iPad. Unfortunately the laptop takes a long time to load.

A: - J. Tracey: – I will ask IT about this, it might be an internet connection issue.

Stuart Purcell spoke about moving towards emailing responses to constituents to save time and costs. Could Councillors ask whether this would be an acceptable method of communication during their surgeries?

A: - Currie: – please add this as a stage on the simple guide.

Q: - Sansome: – Can the presentation be emailed to all Councillors?

A: - Yes.

Councillor Currie thanked the Officers for their presentation and contribution to the discussion. He asked Stuart and Jean to progress the simple guide and training sessions on e-casework.

Resolved: - That the information shared be noted.

APPOINTMENTS PANEL
20th November, 2014

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Beaumont, Hoddinott, Middleton, Steele and C. Vines.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S SERVICES APPOINTMENTS

Consideration was given to the appointments of:-

- David McWilliams in respect of the appointment of an Interim Director of Commissioning and Performance Management – David was currently Head of Children's Services, Performance Assurance at Lincolnshire County Council.
- Maureen Evans in respect of the appointment of an Interim Director of Universal and Targeted Services – Maureen was currently the Children and Younger Adults Locality Manager at Derbyshire County Council.

Both appointments were recommended by Ian Thomas who would take up the position of Strategic Director of Children and Young People's Services in January, but had already started some work in Rotherham with agreement of his current employers.

Resolved:- That both appointments be offered on a secondment basis for an interim period of three months following confirmation by the Cabinet.

**POLICE AND CRIME PANEL
29th October, 2014**

Present:-

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor R. Sixsmith, M.B.E.

Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor G. Jones (Substitute)

Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council:-

Councillor M. Parker

Councillor T. R. Sharman

Sheffield City Council:-

Councillor H. Harpham (in the Chair)

Councillor T. Hussain

Councillor R. Munn

Co-opted Member:-

Mr. A. J. Carter

Mr. K. Walayat

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillor M. Dyson, Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council

Mayor R. Jones, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor J. Sheppard, Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council

Councillor R. Davison, Sheffield City Council

J19. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman advised the Police and Crime Panel that questions received from members of the public would not be considered today, but that they would be included for the next meeting on the 19th November, 2014.

The 19th November meeting would be a one agenda item meeting to consider the experiences over the last three to four months on the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner with invitations being extended to members of the public, the Chief Constable and the newly elected Police and Crime Commissioner.

All those in attendance would have the opportunity to put forward their views for inclusion in recommendations to the Home Secretary to ensure that the experiences recently would not occur again in the future.

J20. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 11TH AND 18TH SEPTEMBER, 2014

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Police and Crime Panel held on 11th and 18th September, 2014.

With regards to the minutes held on the 11th September, 2014 Councillor Parker referred to a number of matters which included:-

- The answer to Question No. 12 from a member of the public and whether the Chief Constable had been contacted.
- Had the Chairman of the Police and Crime Panel made contact with the Chief Constable with regards to an investigation into perjury with regards to information shared at the Home Affairs Select Committee.
- The former Police and Crime Commissioner had named Councillor Parker and alluded to him being a Councillor at the time. Councillor Parker requested that he be given the right to reply, which was declined at that meeting. However, Councillor Parker now wished to place on record his views and set the record straight in his statement:-

“He was not a Councillor at the time of the seminar in 2005 which appeared to be the time that information was given to Councillors.

He was an OPPOSITION Councillor from 2008 to 2012 and in that time had no documentation placed before him.

In 2002 / 2003 there had been two reports suppressed by the Council, at a later stage the alarmed and secured offices of Risky Business were entered without permission and files removed from locked filing cabinets.

There have also been attempts by the Council to place gagging orders on the press so if anyone in their right mind thought that an Opposition Councillor would under those conditions be privy to any information that would help them to bring the Child Sexual exploitation issue to the fore then he suggested they think again.”

- Clarification as to why the official minute taker was excluded from the confidential decision making session.
- Clarification as to why Councillor C. Vines was not given the opportunity to make a statement regarding his reasons for voting

against the Panel's decision, when he was told he could do so by the Chairman.

In answer to the questions raised the Chairman confirmed he had written to the Chief Constable and received a reply, but this would form the basis of further discussion at the next meeting to which the Chief Constable was invited.

In terms of the information relating to the Home Affairs Select Committee, this was a matter for them to consider.

With regards to the statement by Councillor C. Vines following the decision making session, the Chairman advised that Councillor C. Vines had issued a media statement to which he was entitled.

The Director of Legal and Democratic Services, in response to the query about the recording of the confidential decision making session where the Panel adjourned, confirmed that she had deputised for the official minute taker, who it was felt due to experience was in a better position to support the public during the Panel's recess of what was a very difficult meeting.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 11th and 18th September 2014, be agreed as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

J21. PROPOSED APPOINTMENT OF THE CHIEF FINANCE AND COMMISSIONING OFFICER

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner, which confirmed how the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011 ('the Act'), under Schedule 1, Paragraph 6(1)(b) directed that the Police and Crime Commissioner for a police area must appoint a person to be responsible for the proper administration of the Commissioner's financial affairs (referred to as the Commissioner's Chief Finance Officer).

Under Paragraphs 10 and 11 of Schedule 1, the Panel must review the proposed appointment, hold a confirmation hearing and make a report to the Commissioner on the proposed appointment, including a recommendation to the Commissioner as to whether or not the candidate should be appointed, within a period of three weeks beginning with the day on which the Panel receives notification from the Commissioner of the proposed appointment.

The Acting Police and Crime Commissioner was, therefore, notifying the Panel of the decision recommending acceptance of Mr. Allan Rainford following an in-depth interviewing process by:-

- The Police and Crime Commissioner.
- Michelle Buttery, Chief Executive and Solicitor.

- Bill Wilkinson, former Chief Executive and Treasurer, now PaCCTS Adviser and Chairman of the CIPFA Police Panel.

Following the recruitment, interview and vetting process, the Acting Police and Crime Commissioner was satisfied that Mr. Allan Rainford had suitable experience and understanding of the community of South Yorkshire and the role to which it was proposed he be appointed.

Questions were raised as to whether it was felt appropriate to delay this appointment pending the outcome of the election of the Police and Crime Commissioner on the 30th October, 2014 so that the person elected could be involved in the process and why the letter offering the appointment was dated 27th August, 2014.

The Acting Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that the arrangements for the appointment of the Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer were put in place while the former Police and Crime Commissioner was in post. The position of Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer was a critical position responsible for the proper administration of the Commissioner's financial affairs.

Further information was also provided on the contract termination process and the social responsibility placed on the Police and Crime Panel as to the appointment of the Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer.

The Panel retired to consider legal advice and the role to which it was proposed the candidate be appointed.

The Panel considered carefully all the information that had been shared at the meeting, the profile of the candidate and the answers to the questions before coming to a decision.

The Panel returned to the meeting to announce the decision they had made as part of their discussion.

Resolved:- That the proposed appointment of Mr. Allan Rainford as Chief Finance and Commissioning Officer for the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner for South Yorkshire be approved.